



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Supplementband zu "Strassburger theologische Studien," § 87): "die ältesten Kirchenordnungen," pp. 532-9.

On the Didascalia see the literature in Ehrhardt, pp. 523-8 and add:

F. X. Funk, "La date de la didascalie des apôtres," *Revue de l'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain), Vol. II, pp. 798-809.

C. Holzhey, "Dionysius von Alexandria und die *Didascalia apostolorum*," *Theologisch-praktische Monatsschrift*, Vol. XI, pp. 515-23.

The latest editions and translations are:

F. Nau, *Ancienne littérature canonique Syriacque*. Fascicule I: "La didascalie, c'est-à-dire l'enseignement catholique des douze apôtres et des saints disciples de notre Sauveur." Traduite du Syriac pour la première fois. (Extrait du *Canoniste contemporain*, février 1901 à mai 1902). Paris, 1902; 172 pages.

And last, not least:

Horae Semiticae, No. I: "The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac." Edited from a Mesopotamian manuscript with various readings and collations of other MSS. by Margaret Dunlop Gibson. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1903. x + 236 pages.

Horae Semiticae, No. II: "The *Diadascalia apostolorum* in English," translated from the Syriac. *Ibid.*, xviii + 113 pages.

The latest addition is:

Funk, "Ein Fragment zu den apostolischen Konstitutionen," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1903, pp. 195-202. On the fragment printed by Cotelier, Grabe (*Spicil.*, 1700, I, 54), Hilgenfeld (*Nov. Test. extra can.*, IV), Pitra (1,301), Jacoby, 1902.

EB. NESTLE.

MAULBRONN, GERMANY.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.¹

THIS is practically a rewritten book. Its two volumes are each nearly equal in dimensions to the entire original work. And the rewriting was well worth while. Our age certainly demands above all things, of those who undertake to interpret Scripture, that they shall give to biblical writings their historic setting. Exegesis must be historical or nothing. None appreciate this demand of the times better than Pfeiderer. Few have done more than he, especially in the study of Paul, to illuminate the text by the depiction of the historic conditions and contemporary thought. Hence his *Urchristenthum* was

¹ *Das Urchristenthum; seine Schriften und Lehren, in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang*, beschrieben von OTTO PFLEIDERER. Zweite, neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Berlin: Reimer, 1902. Band I, viii + 696 pages; Band II, v + 714 pages. M. 24.

already in 1887 a great and stimulating work, in spite of a sometimes extreme radicalism. It is proportionately better in 1902. There is something of the genius of Baur in the comprehensiveness of the conception and treatment of the subject. And the spirit of Baur is continually felt, sometimes for the worse, more often for the better.

The first division of Vol. I naturally deals with the apostle Paul, his personality, training, conversion, and call, his letters,² and his theology. Here we cannot too highly commend the chapter on Paul's Græco-Jewish training. Paul was, indeed, no direct disciple of the Stoics, whose great seat of learning was his native town. But long since, Lightfoot, in his admirable dissertation on *Seneca and St. Paul* showed that, consciously or unconsciously, the controlling ideas of Paul's life were ideas which he shared with the great Stoic moralists of his day. In fact, they had already penetrated Judaism by two openings, the philosophy of Philo and the Pharisean ethics and religion of the book of Wisdom. Of the influence of the latter there is indisputable proof in the letters of Paul. He himself may have been unconscious of the preparation he was undergoing to interpret the religious ideas of the Semitic to the Aryan world; he may have had as little sympathy with the broadly receptive spirit of his teacher Gamaliel toward the writings of the Greeks, as he had with Gamaliel's tolerant attitude toward the Christians. But Paul's great conceptions of the antithesis of flesh and spirit, Messiah as a *θεὸς σωτήρ*, the inworking of God in man, both to will and to do, his mysticism, his pleroma doctrine of the "heavenly," "spiritual" man who is "the head of every man," in whom all distinctions of bond and free, Jew and gentile, male and female, disappear, cannot be fully appreciated without the realization that Paul *knew* the thought and religious aspiration of the Greek world, even if in his youthful days he may have viewed it with hostility, just as he *knew* the beliefs and hopes of the Christians whom he persecuted, and afterward found them the key to his own soul's problems.

Personally the present writer cannot but feel that Pfleiderer fails (pp. 60-73) to do justice to the value of Romans, chap. 7, as a historical source. Paul's conversion was not due to misgivings as to his logic. He could not have ascribed it so directly to God if it had been. The crisis was primarily moral, not intellectual. The collapse of his Pharisaism was due to his sense of the hopelessness of the struggle against

² Only 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, and the pastoral epistles being treated as mainly spurious.

the "law of sin in his members," so long as he was bound to that "body of death," the flesh. The experience described in the great autobiographic chapter is *made* general; but its note is too keen and anguished not to come originally from Paul's most vital experience; and that experience is one whose closest affinities are with Stoicism, not Pharisaism, though Paul may very well have failed to realize this.

A more distinctive feature, however, of Pfeiderer's present treatment of the narrative is his frank adoption of the theory that the Jerusalem conference of Acts, chap. 15, Gal. 2: 1-10, belongs chronologically *before* Acts, chaps. 13, 14. His chief reason is Paul's description of the scene of his earlier missionary activity in Gal. 1: 2, as "the regions of Syria and Cilicia," with no mention of the important provinces evangelized on the "first missionary journey." It might be added that the "Jerusalem decrees" are also addressed to the Christians of "Antioch, *Syria and Cilicia*," the compiler of Acts manifestly stretching his sources when in 16: 4 he makes Paul and Silas deliver them also to the Galatian churches.

The theory is a somewhat radical departure, and those who defend the invariable accuracy of Luke will be justified in strongly urging the manifest intention of Acts to group together the missionary enterprise of chaps. 13, 14, winding up, as it does, with the report of the missionaries of how God "had opened the door of faith to the gentiles," with the effort of the reactionary party in Jerusalem to impose the yoke of the law. Moreover, Paul's statement of his motive for steadfast resistance in Jerusalem "that the truth of the gospel might abide with you" (Gal. 2: 5), certainly is more significant on the view of Zahn. Still, if the first missionary journey be placed, with Pfeiderer, between the Jerusalem conference and Peter's coming to Antioch, there would seem to be no insuperable objection. This early dating of the Jerusalem council implies, however, too great and radical changes in accepted conceptions of events to be easily admitted. It must for the present be regarded as *sub lite*.

On the other hand, Pfeiderer's representation (p. 86) of Peter's conduct at Antioch can fairly be declared behind the times. Baur's view of Peter as a direct antagonist of Paul, a leader of the Judaizers, is definitively superseded. Peter cannot be supposed at Antioch to have been deliberately false to the pledge so frankly and cordially given at Jerusalem. And Barnabas! Would Barnabas, after having won his case along with Paul at the decisive session in Jerusalem, be now carried away with a "dissimulation" which had no greater backing than

a few "delegates from James"? Of course, the question raised at Antioch must have been a new question. Gentile freedom from the Law was a settled issue. But the context is perfectly explicit regarding the real point in debate. The vacillation of Peter "and the rest of the Jews" was not caused by misgivings as to gentile laxity, but as to their own. They were in doubt as to *their* duty in the matter of "eating with the gentiles." They did, from Paul's point of view, by withdrawing, "compel the gentiles to Judaize" to the extent of purging the tables of "pollutions." But they were not consciously false to their pledge. They were making no propaganda of legalism. They might even have replied to Paul that *he*, by insisting that they should eat, "asking no questions for conscience' sake" as to the legal purity of the food, was really the violator of the agreement, and was "compelling the Jews to heathenize." Thus the issue between Peter and Paul was not one of principle, but only of the application of the Jerusalem agreement. At first Peter gave it Paul's interpretation. Jews among gentiles were to be "as without the law." When the delegation came "from James" he took the view of James embodied in the four decrees, which from their contents are clearly drawn (of course subsequent to Peter's visit to Antioch) to meet precisely this issue.³ The conduct of Barnabas is inexplicable on any other understanding of the case. In view of the fundamental importance of a right conception of the issue it is unfortunate that Pfeiderer's representation should seem to imply that Peter and even Barnabas were now actually renewing the demand of the legalists, although these had just met, at their own hands, a complete and signal overthrow.

We may pass more rapidly over Pfeiderer's treatment of the historical books. His well-known very late dating of Matthew is less in opposition to accepted views than might appear. For Pfeiderer himself admits the circulation of an earlier form of the gospel, and his opponents on their part tend more and more to admit the lateness of some of its editorial features. That it was unknown in its present form to Luke is a contention in which Pfeiderer will have constantly increasing support.

We find ourselves fully in accord with Pfeiderer's increasingly positive demand (p. 400) for some measure of return to the *Urevangelium* theory by way of supplement to the overworked "two-document" idea.

³ Even the warning against "fornication" has the same bearing as those against "polluted" foods. *Clem. Hom.* explains that "fornication and adultery are unlike all other sins, in that they defile not only those guilty, but also *those who eat or associate with them.*"

The relation of Luke to Mark, especially in the story of the passion, cannot be explained—Johannes Weiss is the latest to reiterate the fact—by anything short of a fundamental common source, call we it the *Ur-Markus*, or Lucan Special Source. But Pfeiderer makes too little of his own principles, and too much of the inventiveness of our third evangelist, when he conceives him, *e. g.*, as developing the temptation story, Luke 4: 1-13, out of the mere allusion of Mark 1: 12, 13, or the Baptist's preaching, Luke 3: 10-14, from his own inner consciousness.

His historical criticism is open to more serious objection. To say that in the transactions of the upper room there is no prospect of death and that the Last Supper itself reflects only *Siegesgewissheit* (!) in the confident expectation of an earthly kingdom (p. 388) is to make the whole story of Gethsemane incomprehensible. Even if we suppose Luke 22: 35-8 to reflect the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, without any coloration due to the evangelist's desire to find a fulfilment of the Scripture, "He was reckoned with the transgressors," in the arrest itself, instead of subsequent time in general, as the context and the parallel in John 15: 16-16: 4, would indicate, still Jesus' unwillingness to perish by the dagger of a midnight assassin in the pay of Annas will not prove that he still cherished at this time the expectation of temporal success. In reality the saying has far more to do with the contrasted conditions under which the Twelve are henceforth to do their service in preaching the kingdom, than with Jesus' own present danger.

We may say in general that, in attributing the spiritualization of Jewish messianism to Jesus' followers rather than to himself, even denying to Jesus personally any application to himself of the title "Son of man," Pfeiderer is carrying a justifiable principle of criticism to an unjustifiable extreme. Doubtless the tragedy of Calvary had incomparable effect in transforming the crude messianism of the disciples into a religious faith. It is well to emphasize this neglected fact. But without the previous vain efforts of Jesus, on which all the gospels so persistently dwell, to effect this transformation, the reaction from despair to faith would never have come. If Jesus had never applied to himself the prophecy, if not the title, of the "Son of man," or pointed to a victory even over the power of Sheol itself, the tragedy of Calvary would have been the final obliteration of his life-work. To attribute to Jesus' followers rather than to himself the transfiguration of mere Jewish messianism into germinant Christianity, accomplished as it was in the flaming crucible of suffering and disaster, but impossible without

a heroic faith in God and a sublime insight of spirituality to be learned from him alone, is to seek the source of day in mere paltry satellites. The beginning of the faith was that Jesus' disciples "remembered" that he had thus taught them.

The second volume includes a third division on Hellenism and Gnosticism, a fourth on "Ecclesiastical Literature, of Doctrine and Exhortation," and a fifth on "Proto-Christian Apologetics." The classification is significant. Before passing from the Palestinian type of thought represented by the synoptic writers and in some degree by Paul, we are given an insight—and a very illuminating and helpful one, into the conditions of religious thought and practice in the Hellenic world which Christianity is about to invade, undergoing itself change and assimilative development in the process.

Here, however, we must again dissent. The keen analysis of criticism can detect real differences between the Paulinism of the period before and after the Cæsarean imprisonment, though perhaps not greater than between the eschatology of 1 Corinthians and Philippians; but it is helpless in face of the task of accounting for the so-called deutero-Paulinism of Ephesians-Colossians, without another Paul. That Paul in the interim between Romans and Philemon should have passed to new and larger conceptions of the Christ whom he was resolved to know spiritually only and not after the flesh, and that with the receding of the legalistic question from the chief focus of battle in favor of new controversies against tendencies of Greek and Hellenistic rather than pharisaic type, and should develop a logos doctrine in all but the name, and a *pleroma* doctrine complete, is less incredible than any theory hitherto advanced for the non-Pauline origin and influence of Colossians and Ephesians. The fact is, it is just this personality of Paul which explains the transition of Christianity from a spiritualized type of Jewish messianism to a world-religion satisfactory both to the instincts of individual religion now expressing themselves in the "mysteries" and cults of the thiasi, and at the same time to the speculative logic of philosophy as exploited by Gnostics and Theosophists. If we had not the record of just this unique personality, we should have to postulate it. The admittedly genuine Pauline epistles go far beyond the point of development of synoptic tradition, taken as a whole. Chronologically earlier, they contain a far more universalized, Hellenized type of Christianity. In the same way the christological epistles go beyond their time. The genius of Paul explains them better than mere imitation by a later and more developed age.

It is all the more needless for Pfeiderer to give up as interpolated the passage, Phil. 2: 6, 7, which in the former edition (pp. 150, 218) he rightly interpreted as a contrast with Gen., chap. 9, and to carry down the discussion of Colossians and Ephesians until after his admirable review of Hellenism and Gnosticism, that in this very review he corroborates so much of Friedländer's argument for the pre-Christian origin of some New Testament types of Gnosticism, *e. g.*, the Cainites (p. 53). His exhibition of the Persian and Babylonian elements in current syncretistic theosophy and ritual is in line with Gunkel's and Cumont's researches, and has recently been supplemented by Grill.⁴ To place these alongside of the relics of early Gnosticism in apocryphal acts and gospels, which exhibit the popular form of these speculative systems, is a good arrangement for interpretative purposes. The writings in question may be late relics of the type of thought they represent; but some knowledge of this type of thought should precede interpretation of the writings of the Pauline school, and still more the Johannine.

It is surely a sign of promise for ultimate agreement in questions of New Testament criticism, that critics of all schools are now so closely in agreement, not only with one another, but with the positive and unequivocal statement of second-century tradition on the question of the date of Revelation. Doubtless Pfeiderer is right in declaring this book, despite the immense progress of the last two decades of criticism and interpretation, "still the most obscure of the whole New Testament." Nevertheless, to have reached a practically unanimous result of so vital a kind, involving the complete abandonment of one of the strongholds of Tübingen, may well encourage us. Moreover, the agreement as to the composite character of the work, involving the incorporation of older Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse, is scarcely less complete. Perhaps there may never be agreement as to details of documentary analysis; but with recognition of Ephesus as the *milieu*, 95 A. D. as the approximate date, and adapted Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse as the material, we have the essential factors of the problem. Its solution becomes now simply a question of advancing knowledge of conditions in proconsular Asia at this date, and of the class of literature to which the book belongs.

It may seem strange, in view of the almost invariable practice of apocalyptic writers, that Pfeiderer does not raise the question of pseu-

⁴ *Die persische Mysterienreligion im römischen Reich und das Christenthum.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1903.

donymity in the case of Revelation, but takes instead the easy course of dismissing the "prophet John" as a character of no importance. Certainly he is right in declaring (p. 420) that "the whole Johannine problem in recent times among us has been switched onto a siding without issue, by the manner in which the presbyter John with his fellows has been padded out to the dimensions of a historical factor." Pfleiderer seeks to account for the authoritative attitude of the "John" of Revelation toward the Seven Churches of Asia by the prophetic spirit which inspired him, but Philadelphia, Sardis, Thyatira, and the rest will also have had their prophets. What makes "John" so important a character that a prophecy coming through him should have predominant authority? For "John to the Seven Churches of Asia" is not the same as "the Spirit to the Churches." Recognize, as all must who have given critical scrutiny to the facts, that there is no evidence whatsoever for any presbyter John *in Asia*, and the only alternatives for Revelation are complete authenticity, or pseudonymity like that of practically all other writings of the class. Here is the dividing line for the question so fundamental for the Ephesian canon called "Johannine," whether the second-century tradition of the son of Zebedee in Asia rests upon the early acceptance of Revelation, or whether it has genuine historical foundation. Revelation, if not genuine, could scarcely have been so heartily and gladly accepted by men like Papias and Justin, appearing as it did almost within the recollection of these men, if not within the very lifetime of the apostle himself, had John lived in Asia "until the times of Trajan." The churches of Asia, if John were still living among them, must have known whether the work was authentic or not. Its pseudonymity, then, implies rejection of the tradition of John in Asia. Conversely the welcome given to this authoritative ally by the champions of chiliasm in the Asiatic church, while it does not prove any knowledge on their part of the situation so vaguely described as being "in the isle Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," affords at least half the explanation for the later formed tradition. The other half is afforded by the traditional association of Polycarp with the apostle, which played so great a part in the later quartodeciman controversy, but by no means requires any other scene than Palestine for the intercourse in question.

It can hardly fail to be felt as something of an omission in a history of "Early Christianity, its Literature and Doctrine in Their Historical Connection," that nothing whatever should be said on the question

of John in Asia, and nothing of the relation of the Asiatic school to the Palestinian; but of this we shall have more to say in discussion of our author's method in general.

Rejecting the apostolic authorship of Revelation, Pfeiderer feels, of course, no objection to the authenticity of the gospel and epistles of John on the score of the extreme difference in style, vocabulary, doctrinal standpoint, and all other marks of authorship between the former and the latter. Needless to say, his analysis of the doctrinal and historical contents of what we may designate the *logos* literature is not thereby made more favorable to the claims of tradition. On the contrary, the relation of the fourth gospel to synoptic tradition,⁵ is one of complete dependence, practically all the new matter, whether of discourse or narrative, being historically valueless, and the changes always in the direction of doctrinal prepossession. The relation of Johannine doctrine to Pauline and deuter-Pauline thought is properly shown to be preponderant and that to Alexandrianism both less direct and less considerable. The *logos* doctrine of "John" borrows little more than its terminology from the latter. Like the *logos* doctrine of Ignatius, to which it gives a larger, freer, and more philosophic expression, it rests upon the Pauline epistles. It is to be understood only in antithesis to the docetic Gnosticism which it opposes, and represents against these speculations an "interpretation" of the life and teachings of Jesus in the light of Paulinism, as truly as Papias represents the "interpretations" of the concrete, traditional, Palestinian school.

It is no small merit of Pfeiderer to have placed the fourth gospel and Johannine epistles in their proper historical relation between the deuter-Pauline writings and the second-century apologists, showing how the Pauline conceptions were capable of interpreting the gospel in a way to supersede the speculative mysticism and theosophy of nascent Gnosticism by a deeper, truer metaphysic, while men of the type of Luke, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias were doing their utmost to preserve and defend the historic tradition as it had been delivered by the eyewitnesses, elders, and ministers of the Word. Each branch of the Asiatic church, the Pauline and the elder apostolic, did its own share in the great period of conflict and transition which covers the first half of the second century. The common foe was docetic Gnosti-

⁵Represented in this author's hands, as Pfeiderer thinks, by Mark, Luke, and some gospel kindred to Matthew and perhaps to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, but itself not our Matthew.

cism, and the Johannine writings will be understood when they receive their place as the application of Paulinism to this great crisis. The mere question who wrote the books is of slight importance compared with some such historical understanding of them. Doubtless our estimate of the degree of accuracy with which the fourth gospel reproduces the teachings of Jesus and the events of his career will be radically transformed by a dating in 125-40 A. D., just as they are already profoundly affected in circles which cling to the traditional authorship, by the forced acknowledgment of its highly subjective character and distortion of historical perspective. This can hardly appear otherwise than a loss, at least for the time being, and in the eyes of the general reader. But the criticism, however radical, which can vindicate itself by giving to these greatest writings of all literature their true historical setting, enabling us to read them in the new light of their author's real purpose and environment, will deserve only the heartiest thanks of church as well as world of scholarship. To this end the work of Pfleiderer offers an undeniable and valued contribution.

The group of writings which is next discussed includes 1 Peter, Jude, 2 Peter, the apocalypse of Peter, the Shepherd of Hermas, epistle of James, epistle of Barnabas and Didaché, under the head *Gemein-christliche* ("katholische") *Erbauungs-Schriften*; and the Clementine Writings⁶ in a group by themselves. One can see little reason, aside from the mere superscription, for classifying 1 Peter with the pseudo-Petrine writings, or in fact with the rest of this group. It is true that Pfleiderer regards it as pseudonymous and dates it under Trajan; also that it is not doctrinal in character, but practically hortatory. But it is far more illuminative to discuss it in connection with the development of the Paulinism which it reflects, in the Asiatic churches which it addresses, than to throw it into so promiscuous a lot as is here assembled. What requires to be done is carefully to analyze out the non-Pauline elements of the doctrine of this unquestionably early and important document and thus gain from it some idea of the progress of Christian thought among the Pauline churches in Asia. Its Paulinism is undeniable. Its non-Pauline element is for some reason called Petrine. The present reviewer is content to be as conservative as Moffatt in thinking that the real reason may well be that Peter himself had something to do with the writing of it. Whether this be the case or not, the early use of the writing, its genuineness and simplicity

⁶ 1 and 2 Clement, Homilies, and Recognitions.

of character, should preserve it from such mere cursory handling as Pfeiderer's. Even Jude and 2 Peter deserve to be treated more from the point of view of the history of early Christian thought than that of mere introduction. We have a superfluity of "Introductions" which discuss for us, sometimes polemically from the apologetic or the anti-traditional side, less often in the truly critical spirit, the mere questions of date and authorship which Pfeiderer threshes over again. But surely the work of the historian goes beyond this. Let the best and most rational conclusion available be adopted on these disputed points, and then proceed. We wish to know what relation the writing bears to the course of events and the development of Christian thought.

The same criticism applies to the whole series of writings thrown together in such miscellaneous fashion between the Johannine writings and apologists. They have no significance where they stand, and might as well be anywhere else, save that in Pfeiderer's opinion they date about this time.

The writings of the apologists, from the preaching of Peter to Tertullian and the epistle to Diognetus, form a more consistent group, and are perhaps fairly included in the history here treated. At least it is well for the public, and perhaps for some scholars, to realize how indefinable is the line which separates the canonical from post-canonical writings. Moreover, the theology of the apologists affords certainly a more general and fairer view of Christian thought in its earliest maturity than that of the anti-Gnostic controversialists; otherwise one would wonder why Tertullian should be included and Irenæus excluded. But Christianity vindicating itself before the world forms a fitting scene with which to close the drama, and we are not reluctant with our applause as the curtain falls.

But why, oh why, in a book of over 1,400 octavo pages are we left absolutely without the means of recovering the passage we would fain refer to again? A meager list of passages quoted from biblical and other authors, and a still more meager table of contents prefacing the second volume, constitute the entire apparatus of this kind. Index there is none whatever! Can it be that this is not intended as a work of reference? The style is indeed easy and flowing; footnotes, instead of exhibiting an immense thesaurus of learned material, are conspicuous by their absence; one moves on through the book as if listening to a course of public lectures; and for this method of exposition of his subject Professor Pfeiderer's natural endowments admirably qualify him. He has a lucidity of style, a vividness in presentation,

an aptness in seizing and setting forth the point of real interest, which make the book, in spite of its size, thoroughly readable. Moreover, Pfeiderer is too genuine a scholar to treat his subject superficially. The absence of references and footnotes is no indication of inadequate preparation. The work is a truly great one, a work which for its readable qualities might well repay translation.

The general criticism which we have to make is one which goes deeper and concerns the method itself of the writer. The title promises a consideration of proto-Christian literature and doctrine *in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang*. The distinctive feature of this title, classifying the book as something more than an introduction to New Testament literature, is the promise to exhibit for the reader the historical connection of the writings. It is something which calls aloud in our day to be done, and we may reasonably look to one of the great disciples of Baur to do it. What Baur attempted for the disordered results of mere negative criticism in his day, classifying the literary material which a dawning criticism had robbed of its traditional status, on the basis of a critical survey of the historical conditions of its origin, deserves in our day to be attempted anew. But Pfeiderer cannot be said to have adequately fulfilled his promise, if he has even attempted it in this sense. The book is little more than another "introduction," in somewhat more flowing style, with somewhat fuller paraphrastic synopsis of the contents, and inclusion of some of the post-canonical writings. The reader must to a very large extent furnish his own *geschichtlichen Zusammenhang*.

Nor is this a mere fault of omission, nor excusable from want of material. It is a fault of method, of the general conception of the subject. Thus the lack of appreciation of the importance of geographical relations is significant. In the reviewer's judgment one of the best features of the book is the appreciation as never before, not even in the earlier editions of the work itself, of the importance for our understanding of Paul of some knowledge of the Mithra-mysteries. Grill's work, already referred to, sums up briefly (p. 50) such a mass of coincidences, in both doctrine and practice, as make accidental coincidence simply insupposable. Above all the rest, Paul's circular to the churches of the Lycus valley, known as Ephesians, becomes for the first time fully intelligible when read in the light of the doctrine of the mysteries, especially those of Mithra. But Harnack has shown that western Asia Minor, and the Hellenic lands in general, remained almost completely free from the influence of this Persian religion

which spread over almost all the rest of the Roman Empire. How, then, account for the presence of ideas in Ephesians, which can scarcely have grown up save in contact with this religion? There is one great exception to the geographic distribution above spoken of. Cilicia was the earliest seat of Mithra-worship in all the Græco-Roman world. Tarsus was its headquarters, as it was of the Stoicism which has also left its indelible imprint upon the myths of Mithra. Be the facts what they may regarding the early interrelation of these rival religions of the individual soul and personal immortality through communion with a Deliverer God, which competed for the adhesion of the Græco-Roman world, geographical relations, as well as time relations, fall to be considered.

Still more significant of this lack is the grouping of his material by our author, and his method of treatment. In general we have a group of writings paraphrased in a concise and really admirable synopsis, then an analysis of the "theology of" the writer or writers in question. This works fairly well at the beginning, for, in spite of the earlier "theology" of the material which they contain, our synoptic writers are themselves dominated by a Pauline and post-Pauline theology. And it is well to be reminded of the fact. We can therefore regard as in some sense "historical" an order which even brings in "The Preaching of Jesus and Belief of the Primitive Church" at the very end of Vol. I. In some sense this is at least chronological. We have already expressed our approval of the unchronological discussion of Hellenism and Gnosticism before the writings of the deutero-Pauline and Johannine school. But why should we have under the general head of "Johannine Writings" first a paraphrase of Revelation, the gospel and epistles of John, then a discussion of their date and authorship, followed by an analysis of "The Johannine Theology," as if all five writings represented a common type of thought, or stages of development in the same school? What, pray, has the theology of the last four to do with the first, save the bare accident that in its present form Revelation happens to have been written in Ephesus, and purports to be the work of "John," though not as Pfeiderer thinks, the same John as he to whom the other writings are ascribed? Classify the logos literature with the Ignatian letters, or connect it with Ephesians and Hebrews; or with Justin, if you will, but by what right of "historical connection," save mere coincidence of name, can it be grouped with Revelation to form the basis of an alleged "Johannine theology"?

The fact is, a work purporting to give us the "historical connection

of early Christian literature" should cut loose entirely from the methods and the groupings of the New Testament introductions. Instead of a repetition of the debates on dates and authorship of which we are weary, there should be at least the attempt to depict the development of the great early-Christian schools of thought, the Palestinian, Antiochian, Ephesian, Alexandrian, Roman. Instead of a nondescript group labeled "Johannine" for merely traditional reasons, after the tradition has been abandoned, we should have an outline of Paulinism and ultra-Pauline Gnostic docetism in Asia. Writings bearing upon the history of Christianity in Ephesus and Asia should be grouped according to their relation to the history. We should have Romans, chap. 16, utilized, to begin with. Ephesians, Colossians, the pastoral epistles, Acts, chaps. 19, 20, the Leucian Acts,⁷ Ignatius and Polycarp, and the fourth gospel and epistles of John. We should learn something of Cerinthus, of the Docetic controversy and the application of the logos doctrine of Paul to meet it. We should have Revelation brought in in its "historical" relation in connection with the chiliastic controversy. We should be shown Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias on the one side, and the Docetists who "perverted the sayings of the Lord to their own lusts, denying that there is either resurrection or judgment," on the other. We should trace the transfer of Palestinian tradition after the destruction of the Jerusalem church in the war of Bar Cochbar, to Ephesus. We should understand the sacramentarian position of the fourth gospel with relation to the quartodeciman controversy, on the one side, and Gnostic deniers of a Christ whose flesh is the food of immortality, or who came by blood and not by water only, on the other. Baldensperger's attempt to define one of the apologetic interests of the fourth evangelist would receive more consideration. There would be less clinging to Baur's holy-coat fetish, as if the unity of the fourth gospel precluded all attempts to investigate the history of its material.

Perhaps we demand too much of science in its present stage. But at least let us keep this ideal: Something more than a mere chronological dating of books and summary of their contents, something more even than a general background of the thought and belief of the

⁷One result of this bringing together of writings which have real historical connection will be some surprising confirmations of criticism. What could be more unlooked for than confirmation of SCHULTZ's theory of Rom., chap. 16, as originally addressed to Ephesus, discovered in the Gnostic *Acts of John* (ca. 160 A. D.), which certainly reflect ancient Ephesian traditions? Yet the very center of the opening scene of the drama in the *Acts of John* is the house of *Andronicus*. Cf. Rom. 16:7.

times. Let us have the New Testament books—nay, all the writings of primitive Christianity—in the place and conditions and circumstances of their origin, in their relation to the historical progress of ecclesiastical thought and life in the various branches of the church. For what Pfeiderer has given let us be grateful, and let us look for more to come.

BENJAMIN W. BACON.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn.

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

WHAT Huck endeavored to do for students of the Greek New Testament has been done in France for Bible readers in general by Morel and Chastand.¹ One is attracted to this latest arrangement of the gospel text by the first word on the cover—"concordance." The authors do not attempt another "harmony;" but believing that a careful comparison of the first three gospels constitutes "the best and most accessible commentary on the text," they give, under 136 appropriate headings, a translation of the synoptic text, with only such passages from John as run parallel with the earlier narratives. The book is polychrome. Mark's column is uncolored, his text being regarded as the oldest; Matthew's is pink, and Luke's green. Material from the fourth gospel has a yellow ground. For convenience and attractiveness—not unimportant qualities of any book—this concordance is admirable. Yet it is something more than a simple comparative arrangement of the text; it contains a considerable number of interpretative notes. One class of these refers to current Protestant and Catholic translations of the gospels into French, of which there are no less than thirteen. Another class, in larger type, gives carefully selected passages of Scripture that bear on the understanding of the text, *e. g.*, the original of the quotations, in some instances according to the LXX as well as according to the Hebrew. There are some critical notes on important variants and on other textual phenomena, but these are subordinated to the practical aim of the book. As to the chronological arrangement of the text it may be noted that the rejection in Nazareth is placed by the side of Mark 6:1-6, and not, as even the seventh edition of Broadus² gives it, in connection with Matt. 4:13. The Johannean

¹ *Concordance des évangiles synoptiques.* Par ERNEST MOREL ET GÉDÉON CHASTAND. Lausanne: Bridel, 1902. 140 pages.

² *A Harmony of the Gospels in the Revised Version.* By JOHN A. BROADUS. Revised by ARCHIBALD THOMAS ROBERTSON. New York: Armstrong & Son, 1903. xvii + 290 pages.